

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/551,552	Applicant(s) D'ELIA ET AL.	
	Examiner CHANTEL GRAHAM	Art Unit 1797	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) CHANTEL GRAHAM. (3) Teddy Grun.

(2) Michael Marcheschi. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 16 October 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: all.

Identification of prior art discussed: all applied.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: discussed differences between cavitation and lubricity. It is the position of the office that the function of a component is immaterial and burden is upon applicants to show evidence otherwise.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

	/Michael A Marcheschi/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1797
--	--